

Electronic Acknowledgement Receipt

EFS ID:	4921886
Application Number:	10532163
International Application Number:	
Confirmation Number:	8334
Title of Invention:	Method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	Ah Hwee Tan
Customer Number:	23505
Filer:	Jonathan Myles Harris/Jennifer Ringer
Filer Authorized By:	Jonathan Myles Harris
Attorney Docket Number:	2085-04100
Receipt Date:	06-MAR-2009
Filing Date:	04-OCT-2005
Time Stamp:	16:54:32
Application Type:	U.S. National Stage under 35 USC 371

Payment information:

Submitted with Payment	yes
Payment Type	Deposit Account
Payment was successfully received in RAM	\$810
RAM confirmation Number	2541
Deposit Account	032769
Authorized User	

The Director of the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayment as follows:

- Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.492 (National application filing, search, and examination fees)
- Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.17 (Patent application and reexamination processing fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.19 (Document supply fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.20 (Post Issuance fees)

Charge any Additional Fees required under 37 C.F.R. Section 1.21 (Miscellaneous fees and charges)

File Listing:

Document Number	Document Description	File Name	File Size(Bytes)/ Message Digest	Multi Part /.zip	Pages (if appl.)
1	Petition for review by the Office of Petitions.	04100PETITIONWITHDRAWHOLDINGABANDONMENT.pdf	91782	no	2
			c1e1e771388940e734bf64f2db92ed6f90c484		

Warnings:

Information:

2	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter	04100CLEINTSTATEMENT.pdf	836242	no	34
			1153c3b74278eacc7540217fdd8c4b4d85a479d5		

Warnings:

Information:

3	Miscellaneous Incoming Letter	04100ATTORNEYSTatement.pdf	82169	no	4
			1a23bf8f1734de3e62dc3b87d4444319127aa87		

Warnings:

Information:

4	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	04100sb0030e_fill.pdf	768324	no	3
			7a4859e80c35db92b346184ced7228ca4e76665a		

Warnings:

Information:

5		04100PRELIMINARYAMENDMENTACCOMPANYINRCE.pdf	153997	yes	21
			e35fefe261d2800861c6e7dbd99d3382e732a56e		

Multipart Description/PDF files in .zip description

	Document Description	Start	End
	Amendment Submitted/Entered with Filing of CPA/RCE	1	1
	Claims	2	8
	Applicant Arguments/Remarks Made in an Amendment	9	21

Warnings:

Information:

6	Fee Worksheet (PTO-06)	fee-info.pdf	29902	no	2
			044cad6b4b14b1534f8b6b48bf7dc7ee69a5c69		

Warnings:

Information:	
Total Files Size (in bytes):	1962416
<p>This Acknowledgement Receipt evidences receipt on the noted date by the USPTO of the indicated documents, characterized by the applicant, and including page counts, where applicable. It serves as evidence of receipt similar to a Post Card, as described in MPEP 503.</p> <p><u>New Applications Under 35 U.S.C. 111</u> If a new application is being filed and the application includes the necessary components for a filing date (see 37 CFR 1.53(b)-(d) and MPEP 506), a Filing Receipt (37 CFR 1.54) will be issued in due course and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the filing date of the application.</p> <p><u>National Stage of an International Application under 35 U.S.C. 371</u> If a timely submission to enter the national stage of an international application is compliant with the conditions of 35 U.S.C. 371 and other applicable requirements a Form PCT/DO/EO/903 indicating acceptance of the application as a national stage submission under 35 U.S.C. 371 will be issued in addition to the Filing Receipt, in due course.</p> <p><u>New International Application Filed with the USPTO as a Receiving Office</u> If a new international application is being filed and the international application includes the necessary components for an international filing date (see PCT Article 11 and MPEP 1810), a Notification of the International Application Number and of the International Filing Date (Form PCT/RO/105) will be issued in due course, subject to prescriptions concerning national security, and the date shown on this Acknowledgement Receipt will establish the international filing date of the application.</p>	

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION(RCE)TRANSMITTAL **(Submitted Only via EFS-Web)**

Application Number	10532163	Filing Date	2005-10-04	Docket Number (if applicable)	2085-04100	Art Unit	2129
First Named Inventor	Ah Hwee TAN			Examiner Name	Adrian L. Kennedy		

This is a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 of the above-identified application.

Request for Continued Examination (RCE) practice under 37 CFR 1.114 does not apply to any utility or plant application filed prior to June 8, 1995, or to any design application. The Instruction Sheet for this form is located at WWW.USPTO.GOV

SUBMISSION REQUIRED UNDER 37 CFR 1.114

Note: If the RCE is proper, any previously filed unentered amendments and amendments enclosed with the RCE will be entered in the order in which they were filed unless applicant instructs otherwise. If applicant does not wish to have any previously filed unentered amendment(s) entered, applicant must request non-entry of such amendment(s).

☐ Previously submitted. If a final Office action is outstanding, any amendments filed after the final Office action may be considered as a submission even if this box is not checked.

☐ Consider the arguments in the Appeal Brief or Reply Brief previously filed on _____

☐ Other _____

☒ Enclosed

☒ Amendment/Reply

☐ Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

☐ Affidavit(s)/ Declaration(s)

☐ Other _____

MISCELLANEOUS

☐ Suspension of action on the above-identified application is requested under 37 CFR 1.103(c) for a period of months _____.
 (Period of suspension shall not exceed 3 months; Fee under 37 CFR 1.17(i) required)

☐ Other _____

FEES

The RCE fee under 37 CFR 1.17(e) is required by 37 CFR 1.114 when the RCE is filed.

☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees, or credit any overpayments, to
 Deposit Account No 032769

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT REQUIRED

☒ Patent Practitioner Signature

☐ Applicant Signature

Doc code: RCEX

Doc description: Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

PTO/SB/30EFS (03-06)

Approved for use through 03/31/2009 OMB 0551-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it contains a valid OMB control number.

Signature of Registered U.S. Patent Practitioner			
Signature	/Jonathan M. Harris/	Date (YYYY-MM-DD)	2009-03-06
Name	Jonathan M. Harris	Registration Number	44144

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.114. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether the Freedom of Information Act requires disclosure of these records.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspections or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:	Ah Hwee Tan	§	Group Art Unit:	2129
		§		
Serial No.:	10/532,163	§	Examiner:	Kennedy,
		§		Adrian L
		§		
Filed:	October 4, 2005	§	Atty Docket No.:	2085-04100
		§		
For:	Method And System For	§		
	Discovering Knowledge From	§		
	Text Documents	§		

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

Mail Stop RCE
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: March 6, 2009

AMENDMENT

Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action of March 4, 2008, please consider the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed herewith and amend the above-identified application as follows:

Amendments to the Claims are reflected in the listing of claims which begins on page 2 of this paper.

Remarks/Arguments begin on page 9 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1. (Original) A method for discovering knowledge from text documents, the method comprising the steps of:
 - extracting from text documents semi-structured meta-data, wherein the semi-structured meta-data includes a plurality of entities and a plurality of relations between the entities;
 - identifying from the semi-structured meta-data a plurality of key entities and a corresponding plurality of key relations;
 - deriving from a domain knowledge base a plurality of attributes relating to each of the plurality of entities relating to one of the plurality of key entities for forming a plurality of pairs of key entity and a plurality of attributes related thereto;
 - formulating a plurality of patterns, each of the plurality of patterns relating to one of the plurality of pairs of key entity and a plurality of attributes related thereto;
 - analyzing the plurality of patterns using an associative discoverer; and
 - interpreting the output of the associative discoverer for discovering knowledge.
2. (Original) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of extracting from text documents comprises the step of extracting text content from documents containing at least one type of text, image, audio, and video information.
3. (Previously presented) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of identifying the plurality of key entities comprises the step of selecting the plurality of key entities according to frequency of appearance of the plurality of key entities in the semi-structured meta-data.

4. (Previously presented) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of identifying the plurality of key relations comprises the step of selecting the plurality of key relations according to frequency of appearance of the plurality of key relations in the semi-structured meta-data.
5. (Original) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of deriving from the domain knowledge base comprises the step of deriving from a domain knowledge base relating to at least one of taxonomy, a concept hierarchy network, ontology, a thesaurus, a relational database, and an object-oriented database.
6. (Original) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of deriving the plurality of attribute comprises the step of deriving a set of attributes or lower level entities characterizing the plurality of entities relating to the plurality of key entities.
7. (Original) The method as in claim 1, wherein step of the formulating the plurality of patterns comprises the step of formulating concatenated vector representations of the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities relating to the corresponding plurality of key relations.
8. (Original) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of analyzing the plurality of patterns using the associative discoverer comprises the step of analyzing the plurality of patterns using at least one of a neural network, a statistical system, and a symbolic machine learning system.
9. (Original) The method as in claim 8, wherein the step of analyzing the plurality of patterns comprises the step of analyzing the plurality of patterns using an Adaptive Resonance Associative Map.

10. (Currently Amended) The method as in claim 1, wherein the step of interpreting the output of the associative discoverer for discovering knowledge comprises the step of discovering the semantic relations between the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities.
11. (Original) The method as in claim 1, further comprising the step of using a user interface for displaying the semi-structured meta-data, the plurality of key entities, the plurality of key relations, the plurality of attributes, and the knowledge discovered.
12. (Original) The method as in claim 1, further comprising the step of using a user interface for obtaining user instruction for the plurality of key entities and the plurality of key relations.
13. (Original) A computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable program code means embodied in the medium for discovering knowledge from text documents, the computer program product comprising:
 - computer readable program code means for extracting from text documents semi-structured meta-data, wherein the semi-structured meta-data includes a plurality of entities and a plurality of relations between the entities;
 - computer readable program code means for identifying from the semi-structured meta-data a plurality of key entities and a corresponding plurality of key relations;
 - computer readable program code means for deriving from a domain knowledge base a plurality of attributes relating to each of the plurality of entities relating to one of the plurality of key entities for forming a plurality of pairs of key entity and a plurality of attributes related thereto;
 - computer readable program code means for formulating a plurality of patterns, each of the plurality of patterns relating to one of the plurality of pairs of key entity and a plurality of attributes related thereto;
 - computer readable program code means for analyzing the plurality of patterns using an associative discoverer; and

computer readable program code means for interpreting the output of the associative discoverer for discovering knowledge.

14. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for extracting from text documents comprises computer readable program code means for extracting text content from documents containing at least one of text, image, audio, and video information.
15. (Previously Amended) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for identifying the plurality of key entities comprises computer readable program code means for selecting the plurality of key entities according to frequency of appearance of the plurality of key entities in the semi-structured meta-data.
16. (Previously Amended) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for identifying the plurality of key relations comprises computer readable program code means for selecting the plurality of key relations according to frequency of appearance of the plurality of key relations in the semi-structured meta-data.
17. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for deriving from the domain knowledge base comprises computer readable program code means for deriving from a domain knowledge base relating to at least one of taxonomy, a concept hierarchy network, ontology, a thesaurus, a relational database, and an object-oriented database.
18. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for deriving the plurality of attributes comprises computer readable program code means for deriving a set of attributes or lower level entities characterizing the plurality of entities relating to the plurality of key entities.

19. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for formulating the plurality of patterns comprises computer readable program code means for formulating concatenated vector representations of the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities relating to the corresponding plurality of key relations.
20. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for analyzing the plurality of patterns using the associative discoverer comprises computer readable program code means for analyzing the plurality of patterns using at least one of a neural network, a statistical system, and a symbolic machine learning system.
21. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 20, wherein the computer readable program code means for analyzing the plurality of patterns comprises computer readable program code means for analyzing the plurality of patterns using an Adaptive Resonance Associative Map.
22. (Currently Amended) The computer program product as in claim 13, wherein the computer readable program code means for interpreting the output of the associative discoverer for discovering knowledge comprises computer readable program code means for discovering the semantic relations between the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities.
23. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, further comprising computer readable program code means for using a user interface for displaying the semi-structured meta-data, the plurality of key entities, the plurality of key relations, the plurality of attributes, and the knowledge discovered.

24. (Original) The computer program product as in claim 13, further comprising computer readable program code means for using a user interface for obtaining user instruction for the plurality of key entities and the plurality of key relations.
25. (Original) A system for knowledge discovery from free-text documents, comprising:
 - means for extracting semi-structured meta-data from the free-text documents;
 - means for identifying key entities and key relations from the semi-structured meta-data;
 - a knowledge base that defines the attributes of entities;
 - means for formulating patterns based on the key entities and the attributes of entities related to the key entities; and
 - means for analyzing the patterns for knowledge.
26. (Currently Amended) The system according to claim 25 wherein the semi-structured meta-data comprises definition of entities and semantic relations among the entities.
27. (Currently Amended) The system according to claim 25 wherein the semi-structured meta-data is stored in at least one of a permanent ~~or~~ and temporary storage.
28. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the free-text documents comprise text, image, audio, video, or any combination thereof.
29. (Previously presented) The system according to claim 25 wherein the means for identifying key entities selects entities according to the key entities' frequency of appearance in the semi-structured meta-data.
30. (Previously presented) The system according to claim 25 wherein the means for identifying key relations selects relations according to the key relations' frequency of appearance in the semi-structured meta-data.

31. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the knowledge base comprises a taxonomy, a concept hierarchy network, an ontology, a thesaurus, a relational database, an object-oriented database, or any combination thereof.
32. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the attributes of entities comprise a set of attributes or lower level entities characterizing the entities.
33. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the training examples comprises concatenated vectors of the key entities, and the attributes of entities related to the key entities with a key relation.
34. (Currently amended) The system according to claim 25 wherein the means for analyzing the patterns for knowledge ~~pattern analyzer~~ comprises a neural network, a statistical system, a symbolic machine learning system, or any combination thereof.
35. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the pattern analyzer comprises an Adaptive Resonance Associative Map.
36. (Currently Amended) The system according to claim 25 wherein the knowledge comprises implicit hidden key relations between the attributes of the entities and the key entities.
37. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the knowledge discovery system further comprises a user interface for displaying the semi-structured meta-data, the key entities, the key relations, the attributes, and the knowledge discovered.
38. (Original) The system according to claim 25 wherein the knowledge discovery system further comprises a user interface for obtaining user's instruction for the key entities and the key relations.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejections to Claims 1, 13 and 25 under 35 USC § 103

In the Final Office Action, Examiner is of the opinion that many aspects of claims 1, 13 and 25 are disclosed by the prior art He et al (Machine Learning Methods for Chinese Web Page Categorization) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,297,039 to Kanaegami et al. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 1 to 6, 8 to 10, 13 to 18, 20 to 22, 25 to 32 and 34 to 36 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 1, 13 and 25 under 35 USC § 103

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13 and 25 are not obvious over He in view of Kanaegami. Specifically, claims 1, 13 and 25 recite apparatus and methods for discovering knowledge from text documents comprising the aspects of extracting semi-structured meta-data from text documents, identifying key identities and key relations from the semi-structured meta-data, deriving from a domain knowledge base a plurality of attributes, formulating a plurality of patterns, analyzing the plurality of patterns using an associative discoverer and interpreting the output of the associative discoverer for discovering knowledge.

He discloses a method for text categorization for Chinese information by application of three known statistical machine-learning methods to Chinese web page categorization. The three statistical machine-learning methods are namely *k* Nearest Neighbor system (*k*NN), Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Adaptive Resonance Associative Map (ARAM). He investigates the capabilities of these methods in learning categorization knowledge from real-life web documents. In addition, He further investigates whether the incorporation of domain knowledge derived from the category description can enhance ARAM's predictive performance.

Kanaegami discloses a text information extraction system that extracts analysis networks from texts and stores them in a database. The analysis networks consist of lines each including elements and relations extracted from the texts. Further, the analysis networks are complemented via synonym/near synonym/thesaurus process and via complementary template and the lines thereof are weighted via concept template. A text similarity matching device judges similarity of input and database analysis networks on the basis of agreements of words, word pairs, and lines. A text search system stores texts and complementary term lists prepared therefrom in respective databases. Queries are provided to analysis networks from which sets of keywords and relations are extracted. After searching the texts and complementary term lists

stored in databases with respect to the keywords extracted from each input query, agreements of the sets of keywords and relations are determined.

Applicant respectfully reiterates that the inventions of claims 1, 13 and 25 comprise steps of using a domain knowledge base to convert each of the key entities into a plurality of attributes. Although Examiner is of the opinion this feature has been disclosed in Page 93, Right Column, Paragraph 1 and Page 96, Left Column, Paragraph 1 of He, Applicant respectfully submits that He does not disclose the use of any such knowledge base. Instead, He merely discloses a domain knowledge that relates to linking keywords to classes and clearly does not convert the keywords into a plurality of attributes as recited in each of amended claims 1, 13 and 25. In addition, Kanaegami also does not disclose the use of a domain knowledge base that converts each of the key entities into a plurality of attributes as recited in each of amended claims 1, 13 and 25.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the inventions of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, a person having ordinary skills in the art when combining He and Kanaegami would not be able to arrive at the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25. Therefore, claims 1, 13 and 25 are submitted to be allowable.

Furthermore, He relates to a method for categorization of Chinese text while Kanaegami relates to a text search system. Unlike English and other Indo-European languages, Chinese text does not have a natural delimiter between words. This presents the problem of word segmentation when performing Chinese documents processing. He addresses this problem by using rules-based statistical learning machines. Kanaegami does not specifically mention that the disclosed text search system is able to perform Chinese documents processing. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that each of He and Kanaegami teaches an unrelated solution that precludes each other. It would not be obvious for a person having ordinary skills in the art to combine He and Kanaegami to arrive at the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25. Therefore, claims 1, 13 and 25 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 13 and 25 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 2, 14 and 28 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claims 2, 14 and 28. In particular, Examiner is of the opinion that He teaches the step of extracting text context from documents, which contain at least one type of text, image, audio and video information. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 2, 14 and 28 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 2, 14 and 28 under 35 USC § 103

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention.

Claims 2, 14 and 28 describe steps and means for extracting text content from documents containing at least one type of text, image, audio and video information, which involve an improvement to the claimed invention as defined by claim 1, 13 and 25. Without the availability of the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25, a person skilled in the art at the time of invention would not have the knowledge of the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 2, 14 and 28 for extracting text content from documents containing at least one type of text, image, audio and video information. Therefore, claims 2, 14 and 28 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 2, 14 and 28 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 3, 15 and 29 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that Kanaegami discloses claims 3, 15 and 29. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that the “identifying” as claimed by Applicant is anticipated by Kanaegami. In addition, Examiner is further of the opinion that “selecting” as claimed by Applicant is anticipated by keyword extracting as taught in Kanaegami. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 3, 15 and 29 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claim 3, 15 and 29 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 15 and 29 recite steps and means for selecting the plurality of key entities according to at least one of frequency of appearance of the plurality of key entities in the semi-structure meta-data. Key entities are entities obtained from extracting semi-structured meta data from free-text documents that are stored in a meta-data store on a permanent or temporary basis as described in lines 20 to 30 of page 6 of the present application.

Applicant submits that each of claims 3, 15 and 29 needs to be read in totality when interpreting the claimed invention and not be based on a single keyword. More specifically, Kanaegami merely teaches means for searching among complementary term lists generated using search means or list generating means.

In addition, Applicant also respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 3, 15 and 29. Therefore, claims 3, 15 and 29 are submitted to be non-obvious.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 3, 15 and 29 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 4, 16 and 30 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that Kanaegami discloses claims 4, 16 and 30. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that the “identifying” as claimed by Applicant is anticipated by Kanaegami. In addition, Examiner is further of the opinion that “selecting” as claimed by Applicant is anticipated by keyword extracting as taught in Kanaegami. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 4, 16 and 30 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 4, 16 and 30 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 16 and 30 recite steps and means for selecting the plurality of key relations according to at least one of frequency of appearance of the plurality of key relations in the semi-structure meta-data.

Applicant submits that each of claims 4, 16 and 30 needs to be read in totality when interpreting the claimed invention and not be based on a single keyword. Kanaegami merely

teaches means for searching among complementary term lists generated using search means or list generating means.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 4, 16 and 30. Therefore, claims 4, 16 and 30 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 4, 16 and 30 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 5, 17 and 31 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claims 5, 17 and 31. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that a lexicon disclosed in He anticipates the Applicant's claimed taxonomy. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 5, 17 and 31 are obvious.

Response of Claims 5, 17 and 31 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 5, 17 and 31 recite steps and means for deriving from a domain knowledge base relating to at least one of taxonomy, a concept hierarchy network, ontology, a thesaurus, a relational database, and an object-oriented database.

Applicant submits that when interpreting each of claims 5, 17 and 31, they should be read in totality and not be determined solely based on use of a particular word. Although Applicant agrees that lexicon is similar to the claimed taxonomy, claims 5, 17 and 31 relate to derivation from a domain knowledge base of various source types, of which only one of the various source types is related to taxonomy.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 5, 17 and 31. Therefore, claims 5, 17 and 31 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 5, 17 and 31 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 6, 18 and 32 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that Kanaegami discloses claims 6, 18 and 32. In particular, Examiner is of the opinion that parts of speech identified in the analysis networks during syntactical analysis, are attributes and/or lower level entities that characterize the analysis networks as taught in Kanaegami. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 6, 18 and 32 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 6, 18 and 32 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 6, 18 and 32 recite steps and means for deriving a set of attributes or lower level entities characterizing the plurality of entities relating to the plurality of key entities. The set of attributes or lower level entities is exemplary described in lines 20 to 30 of page 12 and lines 1 to 10 of page 13 of the present application as a sub-concept obtained from the domain knowledge base.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claim limitation “characterizing the plurality of entities relating to the plurality of key entities” is included in each of claims 6 and 18 and claim 32. Kanaegami makes no particular mention that the selection of verbs positioned after respective nouns is specifically for characterizing the plurality of entities relating to the plurality of key entities as described in each of claims 6 and 18 and claim 32 of the present application.

Further, Applicant also respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 6, 18 and 32. Therefore, claims 6 and 18 and claim 32 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 6, 18 and 32 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 8, 20 and 34 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claims 8, 20 and 34. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 8, 20 and 34 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 8, 20 and 34 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 8, 20 and 34 recite steps and means of using the associative discoverer comprising, analyzing the plurality of patterns using at least one of a neural network, a statistical system and a symbolic machine learning system.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 8, 20 and 34. Therefore, claims 8, 20 and 34 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 8, 20 and 34 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 9, 21 and 35 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claims 9, 21 and 35. In particular, Examiner is of the opinion that He teaches the use of Adaptive resonance Associative Map (ARAM) for analyzing patterns. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 9, 21 and 35 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 9, 21 and 35 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 9, 21 and 35 recite steps and means for analyzing the plurality of patterns using an Adaptive Resonance Associative Map.

Applicant submits that claims 9, 21 and 35 have to be read in totality together with the preceding claims they are dependent on, which are claims 8, 20 and 34.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 9, 21 and 35. Therefore, claims 9, 21 and 35 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 9, 21 and 35 are respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 10 and 22 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claims 10 and 22. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that discovering of the relations is inherent in the process of category recognition amongst patterns and is taught in He. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 10 and 22 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 10 and 22 under 35 USC § 103

Amended claims 10 and 22 recite a step and a means for interpreting the output of the associative discoverer for discovering knowledge comprising, discovering the semantic relations between the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities.

Applicant agrees that He teaches learning categories consisting of “learning relations” between input and output patterns but is silent on discovering the semantic relations between the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1 and 13 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the method and system of claims 1 and 13 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of amended claims 10 and 22. Therefore, amended claims 10 and 22 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 10 and 22 are respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 26 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claim 26. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that the “words” taught in He are equivalent to the key entities in Applicant’s claimed invention. In addition, Examiner is of the opinion that by disclosing “words” being in “classes”, He anticipates the “relations among the entities” of Applicant’s claimed invention. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claim 26 are obvious.

Response to Rejection of Claim 26 under 35 USC § 103

Amended claim 26 recites the semi-structured meta-data comprising definition of entities and semantic relations among the entities.

Applicant agrees with Examiner that the ‘words’ taught in He are similar to the key entities in Applicant’s claimed invention. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the He disclosure of “words” being in “classes” is not equivalent to the “relations among the entities” of Applicant claimed invention. Specifically, the relations as recited in amended claim 26 refer to semantic relations relating to “words” that can be extracted from text documents without the use of “classes”.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the system for discovering knowledge from text documents of amended claim 26 is not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the system of amended claim 26 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at amended claim 26. Therefore, amended claim 26 is submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 27 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claim 27. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that when He teaches that the lexicon “contains” words, it is inherent that the words are stored in the lexicon and that the lexicon is stored in some form that can be accessed by segmentation model. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claim 27 are obvious.

Response to Rejection of Claim 27 under 35 USC § 103

Amended Claim 27 recites the semi-structured meta-data being stored in at least one of permanent and temporary storage.

Applicant submits that Examiner is applying hindsight in stating that lexicon disclosed by He has to be stored in some form since He makes no specific mention that the lexicon is stored in at least a permanent and temporary storage according to amended claim 27. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner is objecting to claim 27 by making inferences based on the teachings in He that are not found in amended claim 27.

Applicant also respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claim 25 is not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the system of claim 25 would not have been

available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at amended claim 27. Therefore, amended claim 27 is submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 36 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He discloses claim 36. More specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that the “words” taught in He are equivalent to the key entities in Applicant’s claimed invention. In addition, Examiner is of the opinion that by disclosing “words” being in “classes”, He anticipates the “relations among the entities” of Applicant’s claimed invention. Furthermore, Examiner is of the opinion that in broadly teaching relation between entities, He anticipates the specific claiming of “hidden relations”. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claim 36 are obvious.

Response to Rejection of Claim 36 under 35 USC § 103

Amended claim 36 recites the knowledge comprising implicit hidden key relations between the attributes of the entities and the key entities. The hidden key relations are relations pertaining to connecting the key entities’ with other entities or their attributes, which are not explicitly stated in text or domain knowledge base. Applicant submits that He makes no specific mention of implicit hidden key relations between the attributes of the entities and the key entities according to amended claim 36.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claim 25 is not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, the system of claim 25 would not have been available to a person skilled in the art at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at amended claim 36. Therefore, amended claim 36 is submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 36 is respectfully requested.

Rejections of Claims 7, 19 and 33 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He in combination with Kanaegami discloses claims 7, 19 and 33 but does not teach the use of “concatenated vector representation of the plurality of attributes”. However, Examiner is of the opinion that Tan et al (Predictive Self-Organizing

Networks for Text Categorization) (Tan1) anticipates Applicant's claimed "concatenated vector representation". Therefore it would be obvious to combine He, Kanaegami and Tan1 to arrive at claims 7, 19 and 33. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 7, 19 and 33 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 7, 19 and 33 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 7, 19 and 33 describe steps and means for formulating concatenated vector representations of the plurality of attributes and the plurality of key entities relating to the corresponding plurality of key relations.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, hence the combination of He, Kanaegami together with Tan would not then enable a person skilled in the art to make use of the undisclosed method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 7, 19 and 33. Therefore, claims 7, 19 and 33 are submitted to be non-obvious.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 7, 19 and 33 are respectfully requested.

Rejections to Claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 37 and 38 under 35 USC § 103

Examiner is of the opinion that He in combination with Kanaegami and Tan et al (Learning User Profiles for Personalized Information Dissemination) (Tan2) discloses claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 37 and 38. Specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that Tan2 anticipates the "user interface for displaying" and hence the combination of He with Kanaegami and Tan2 enables claims 11, 23 and 37 to be derived. Yet specifically, Examiner is of the opinion that Tan2 anticipates applicant's claimed "user interface for obtaining user instruction". Therefore the combination of He with Kanaegami and Tan2 would enable a person skilled in the art to arrive at claims 12, 24 and 38. Hence, Examiner is of the opinion that claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 37 and 38 are obvious.

Response to Rejections of Claims 11, 23 and 37 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 11, 23 and 37 describe steps and means in which a user interface is used for displaying the semi-structured meta-data, the plurality of key entities, the plurality of key relations, the plurality of attributes and the knowledge discovered.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, hence the combination of He, Kanaegami together with Tan2 would not then enable a person skilled in the art to make use of the undisclosed method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 11, 23 and 37. Therefore, claims 11, 23 and 37 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 11, 23 and 37 are respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections of Claims 12, 24 and 38 under 35 USC § 103

Claims 12, 24 and 38 describe steps and means in which a user interface is used for obtaining user instruction for the plurality of key entities and the plurality of key relations.

Applicant respectfully submits that in accordance to the above response explaining that the method and system for discovering knowledge from text documents of claims 1, 13 and 25 are not disclosed independently or collectively by He and Kanaegami, hence the combination of He, Kanaegami together with Tan2 would not then enable a person skilled in the art to make use of the undisclosed method and system of claims 1, 13 and 25 at the time of invention to improve upon to arrive at each of claims 12, 24 and 38. Therefore, claims 12, 24 and 38 are submitted to be allowable.

Therefore in accordance with the above response, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 12, 24 and 38 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. In the event that an extension of time is necessary to allow for consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Conley Rose P.C.'s Deposit Account No. 03-2769 for such fees.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Harris/

Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS